

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 9734 of 1996

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE M.S.PARIKH

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

RAJESH DURGAPRASAD KAHAR

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

MS SUBHADRA G PATEL for Petitioner

Mr MR ANAND, G.P., with Ms. Ami Yagnik, A.G.P., for
Respondent No.1 - State

SERVED for Respondent No. 2, 3

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE M.S.PARIKH

Date of decision: 22/01/97

ORAL JUDGEMENT

By way of this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India the petitioner - detenu has brought under challenge the detention order dated 29th September 1996 rendered by respondent No.2 u/s. 3(1) of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Act, 1985 (Act No.16 of 1985), for short "the PASA Act".

2. The grounds on which the impugned order of detention has been passed appear at Annexure : B to the petition. They inter-alia indicate that the detenu by himself and with the aid of his associates has been carrying on criminal and anti-social activities of causing hurt to the innocent people with the aid of deadly weapons and extorting money from them and selling and storing country liquor. The detaining Authority has placed reliance upon one offence of 1996 registered in Kareli Bag Police Station, Baroda, under Section 452, 427, 114 I.P.C., one offence of 1996 registered in Raopura Police Station, Baroda, under Section 324, 323, 114 I.P.Code, one offence of 1993 registered in Raopura Police Station, Baroda, under Section 66B, 65E, Bombay Prohibition Act and one offence of 1996 registered in Raopura Police Station, Baroda, under Section 66(1)(B), 65(E) & 81 Bombay Prohibition Act. The particulars of such offences have been set out in the grounds of detention.

3. It has been recited that the detenu's anti-social activity tends to obstruct maintenance of public order and in support of such conclusion statements of three witnesses have been relied upon. They indicate about the incidents dated 9.8.1996, 25.8.1996 and 28.7.1996 indicating beating in public the concerned witnesses and creating atmosphere of fear amongst the people collected at the time of such incidents.

4. It is on the aforesaid incidents that the detaining authority has passed the impugned order of detention while also relying upon the aforesaid cases lodged against the petitioner. The petitioner has been stamped as a dangerous person within the meaning of section 2(c) as also as a boot-legger within the meaning of Section 2(b) of the PASA Act.

5. I have heard the learned Advocate for the petitioner and the learned A.G.P. for the State. The petitioner has challenged the aforesaid order of detention on number of grounds inter-alia on the ground that there is no material to indicate that the detenu's conduct would show that he is habitually engaged in the anti-social activities which can be said to be prejudicial to the maintenance of public order. This is a case of individual incidents affecting law and order and in the facts of the case would not amount to leading to conclusion that the same would affect public order. Reliance has been placed on the following decision of the Apex Court :-

Mustakmiya Jabbarmiya Shaikh V/s. M.M.Mehta,
C.P. reported in 1995 (2) G.L.R. 1268, where
the incidents were quoted in paras : 11 and 12
of the citation and it has been submitted that
facts of the present case run almost parallel to
the facts before the Apex Court in Mustakmiya's
case (supra).

6. In reply Ms.Ami Yagnik, learned A.G.P. for the
State has relied upon a decision in the case of Mrs.
Harpreet Kaur Harvinder Singh Bedi V/s. State of
Maharashtra and anr., reported in AIR 1992 SC 979.
Comparing the facts of the present case with the facts in
the case before the Supreme Court, it clearly appears
that the decision in MrsHarpreet Kaur's case (Supra)
would not be applicable.

7. There are other grounds of challenge levelled
against the impugned order of detention. However, in
view of the fact that the petitioner would succeed on the
strength of decision of Mustakmiya's case (supra), it is
not necessary to deal with the other grounds. Hence,
following order is passed :

8. The impugned order of detention is hereby quashed
and set aside. The petitioner-detenu Rajesh Durgaprasad
Kahar shall be forthwith set at liberty if he is not
required to be detained in any other case. Rule made
absolute accordingly.

* * * * *